

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	<b>CV 11-1626 FMO (CWx)</b>	Date	<b>April 8, 2014</b>
Title	<b>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles v. PCC Technical Industries, Inc., et al.</b>		

Present: The Honorable		Fernando M. Olguin, United States District Judge	
Vanessa Figueroa	None		None
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder		Tape No.
Attorney Present for Plaintiff(s):		Attorney Present for Defendant(s):	
None Present		None Present	
Proceedings:	(In Chambers) Order to Show Cause Re: Supplemental Jurisdiction		

On October 2, 2013, defendants Becker Bros. Steel Supply Co., Shama, a General Partnership, and Shama, LLC (collectively, "Becker Bros. entities") filed their Third Amended Third Party Complaint ("Becker Bros. TATC"). However, the court does not believe it can exercise jurisdiction over the claims for equitable contribution and indemnity (claims six and seven), (see Becker Bros. TATC, Doc. No. 361, at 7-10 & 17-20), against 9901 Alameda, LLC and its principals, John Maddux and Richard Meruelo. In addition, the court does not believe it can exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claim three for equitable contribution filed by PCC Technical Industries, Inc. ("PCC Tech") against 9901 Alameda. (See Answer to Fourth Amended Complaint and Cross-Claims Against 9901 Alameda, LLC, Doc. No. 350, at 13-15 & 19-20). "A district court may only assert supplemental jurisdiction over claims between non-diverse parties whose claims arise out of the 'same transaction or occurrence' as the claim over which the court has unquestioned federal jurisdiction." Great Am. Ins. Co. v. Chang, 2013 WL 1632669, \*3 (N.D. Cal. 2013) (quoting Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. v. Sullivan, 846 F.2d 377, 381-82 (7th Cir. 1988)).

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. No later than **April 15, 2014**, the Becker Bros. entities and PCC Tech shall show cause in writing why the above-reference claims should be retained pursuant to the court's supplemental jurisdiction. Failure to submit a response by the deadline set forth above may be deemed as consent to the dismissal of the claim without prejudice.

2. 9901 Alameda, John Maddux, and Richard Meruelo shall respond to the OSC Responses no later than **April 22, 2014**.

3. A copy of all papers filed with the court shall be delivered to the drop box outside chambers at Suite 520, Spring Street Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, **no later than 12:00 noon the following business day**. All chambers copies shall comply fully with the document

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 11-1626 FMO (CWx)	Date	April 8, 2014
Title	Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles v. PCC Technical Industries, Inc., <u>et al.</u>		

formatting requirements of Local Rule 11-3, including the “backing” requirements of Local Rule 11-3.5. Counsel may be subject to sanctions for failure to deliver a mandatory chambers copy in full compliance with this Order and Local Rule 11-3.

4. Given the voluminous filings in this case, the parties are ordered to include Document Numbers when citing or referring to documents that have been filed in this case.

Initials of Preparer 00 : 00  
vdr